

prehensive judgment/ Such an edition
would have
another advantage, because it would save
the time of
readers who desired to examine Macaulay's
sources. In

his method, or lack of method, of citing
authorities, Mac-
aulay is not a model to be followed. Some
people have
laughed at one of his characteristic phrases.

In chapter iii
he says : ' My notion of the country gentleman
of the
seventeenth century has been derived from
sources too
numerous to be recapitulated. I must leave my
description

to the judgment of those who have studied
the history
and the lighter literature of that age.' ¹ In
chapter xi he

states in a note : ^c Here, and in many other
places, I

abstain from citing authorities, because my
authorities are
too numerous to cite. My notions of the temper
and rela-

tive position of political and religious parties in
the reign of

William the Third, have been derived, not from
any single

work, but from thousands of forgotten tracts,
sermons, and

satires ; in fact, from a whole literature which
is moulder-

ing in old libraries.' ² He repeats the phrase
elsewhere.³

This however is perfectly legitimate. It is
absurd to ex-

pect a historian to cite authorities whenever
he states the

impression he has derived from the whole
mass of facts

which have come under his notice. His
footnotes would be

a monstrous list of titles if he did so. Macaulay

is blame-
worthy however in that, when he refers to
books for definite facts, he very often fails to state where the
passage on
which he bases his statement is to be found,
and does
not cite page or volume or edition. Often he
quotes a
letter without giving its date or any indication
which enables a reader to find the context of the
passage. He is
capable of citing in the same footnote, Evelyn's
Diary with

¹I, 313 (iii).

* in, 1324 (xi).

³1, 360 (iii).